

REMARKS:

In view of the fact that allowable subject matter has been indicated to be present in the case, an earnest effort has been made to bring the application to issue without delay.

1. The priority claim acknowledgment in paragraph 12 of PTOL 326 is appreciated.

2. The objection to the drawing is no longer appropriate. The subject matter of claim 15 has been dropped. Where subject matter from claim 20 now appears, the terminology has been altered so that the illustration in FIG. 10 will suffice.

The shafts are elements 26.

Withdrawal of the objection to the drawing is therefore requested.

3. A Substitute Specification has been provided with section headings, a cross reference to related applications and an insert derived from the claims to replace the reference to the claims in the body of the application. The Substitute Specification does not contain any new matter.

The Substitute Specification is accompanied by a marked-up version showing the changes made.

4. The Examiner's indication that claims 7, 17 and 18 contain allowable subject matter is appreciated. These claims have been replaced by new claims 36, 37 and 38 for which outright

allowance is in order. A charge form is submitted to cover one extra independent claim.

5. Claims 23-35 have replaced the other claims in the case and are carefully drafted to define the invention over the references applied. Since claim 23 defines the baffle-free gas passage and provides that the entrainers have heights of at most the height of the cheeks, it will be readily apparent that none of the references hitherto applied under 35 USC 102 is applicable any longer. For example, it is clear from STAUFFER et al (A) FIG. 2 that there is no equivalent to the baffle-free gas passage just as it is clear that the coal entrainers occupy well more than half the height of the cheeks. In CAIN (D), FIG. 3, element 60 clearly extends vertically over more than half the height of the structures to which they are connected.

In VAN ACKEREN et al (C), (FIG. 3), it is also clear that neither the channel nor the recited height limitation are present. In point of fact, therefore, not claim 23 or any of the other claims of this group is taught by the art relied upon by the Examiner.

In fact, where the Examiner has dealt with claim 2, he has agreed that even VAN ACKEREN does not contain the critical limitation which is now present also in claim 23. The references do not teach the invention as defined in claim 23 from which all of the other claims depend.


The invention could not have been considered to be obvious from any of these references either since there is not the least suggestion in the art of the baffle-free channel which demon-

21714

strates that neither the problem nor the claimed solution was known, understood or attackable in some obvious way prior to applicants' invention.

Favorable reconsideration is urged.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.


By: ~~Herbert Dubno, Reg. No. 19,752~~
~~Attorney for Applicants~~

ef-

30 August 2004
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099

Encls: Substitute Specification
Marked-up orig. Spec.
Fm. 2038 for \$86 (extra ind. claim)